

Serial No. 09/685905

- 7 -

Art Unit: 2143

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Acharya. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15, 18-20 and 34 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The presently claimed invention provides a technique for reducing the possibility of data loss due to delays in processing multicast traffic forwarded to the control path for address resolution. Under certain traffic conditions the multicast data enqueued in the control path can overflow buffers, resulting in data loss. In accordance with the presently claimed invention the multicast data may be flooded to some or all ports until the particular ports associated with the multicast group can be identified via the control path. Consequently, the multicast data is transmitted to the receiver even if the multicast data is dropped in the control path due to buffer overflow.

The distinguishing features described above are recited in the independent claims. For example, claim 1 distinguishes Acharya by reciting "flooding the multicast data from a plurality of ports of the router; and determining an appropriate group of output ports for the multicast group." Claims 8, 15 and 20 recite similar limitations. The current amendments to the claims render the previous rejections moot. Claim 34 originally recited these distinguishing features, and has been amended in an attempt to make the claim language more easily understandable. The Office had indicated that the step of "broadcasting the multicast data from the line card to all other line cards that the line card is configured to communicate with" is shown in Acharya at Col. 22, lines 26-67. Applicant is unable to find any mention of such broadcasting in that passage of Acharya. The Office may be able to produce some other reference which shows

Serial No. 09/685905

- 8 -

Art Unit: 2143


broadcasting. The idea of broadcasting alone is not novel. However, Applicant submits that the recited combination of broadcasting with multicast address resolution is novel and non-obvious. Applicant therefore request that the rejections of claims 1, 8, 15, 20 and 34 be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21-33 and 35-36 further distinguish the invention and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21-33 and 35-36 is therefore also requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nov. 19, 2004  
Date

  
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park Drive  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-468